



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDUCATIONAL NEWS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The report on academic freedom of the American Association of University Professors, by its committee, falls into two sections—the first, a declaration of principles, and the second, a platform of practical reform. Under the first head the committee considered first the *meaning* of academic freedom which, it believes “comprises three elements: freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching . . . ; and freedom of extra-mural utterance and action.” Of these aspects the last is the pressing problem, since “all five of the cases . . . recently investigated by committees of this association have involved . . . the right of university teachers to express their opinions freely outside the university or to engage in political activities in their capacity as citizens.” Yet the committee finds it best to consider the question “primarily with reference to freedom of teaching within the university.”

The committee finds the basis of academic authority to lie in the “board of trustees as the ultimate repositories of power.” Whether in a privately endowed institution or in a state university, the committee wisely concludes that “the trustees are trustees for the public. . . . It follows that any university which lays restriction upon the intellectual freedom of its professors proclaims itself a proprietary institution.”

The distinction between a private and a public trust, the committee finds not as widely understood as it ought to be. In too many universities “the relation of trustees to professors is apparently still conceived to be analogous to that of a private employer to his employees. . . . Trustees are not regarded as debarred by any moral restrictions, beyond their own sense of expediency, from imposing their personal opinions upon the teaching of the institution, or even from employing the power of dismissal to gratify their private antipathy or resentments.”

Then follows the most important passage in the whole report, the paragraph which defines the relation between trustees and the professor:

The latter are the appointees, but not in any proper sense the employees, of the former. For, once appointed, the scholar has professional functions to perform in which the appointing authorities have neither competency nor moral right to intervene. The responsibility of the university teacher is primarily to the public itself, and to the judgment of his own profession; and while, with respect to certain external conditions of his vocation, he accepts a responsibility to the authorities of the institution in which he serves, in the essentials of his professional activity his duty is to the wider public to which the institution itself is morally amenable.

After thus ably defining the status of the faculty, the report discusses the chief dangers to academic freedom, having special reference to the teaching of the social sciences. It discovers these dangers to be two: (1) the danger of restriction in privately endowed colleges and universities on the expression of opinions which point toward extensive social innovations or call into question the practices of large vested interests. (2) In the state university the menace consists in the repression of opinion on similar subjects that might be considered too conservative in view of particular political situations. The committee sadly and perhaps unadvisedly concludes that "it almost seems as if the dangers of despotism can not be wholly averted under any form of government."

What then is the proper check upon the faculties of our universities? Only those restrictions which the professorial office by its very nature imposes on itself: that conclusions "must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry" set forth "with dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language." The initial responsibility for the maintenance of professional standards properly lies, not in the hands of trustees, but in the hands of university teachers themselves. Absolute freedom of research and discussion may legitimately be restricted only in the case of the immature students. It is not proper to consider classroom discussions as public utterances, nor to deprive a college professor of the political rights vouchsafed to every citizen.

After all this labor it is disappointing to find the practical recommendations of the committee somewhat vague. While there ought

to be clear understanding of the tenure of appointment, that reform does not strike at the heart of the problem. Nor is the appointment of a judicial committee of the faculty for the hearing of dismissal cases anything but a negative and unsatisfactory compromise. The initial difficulty lies with the appointing power, that is, in the trustees; and unless the regents are themselves professional in their attitude, the initial cause of much friction will not be removed. A judicial committee of the faculty can hardly prevent trustees minded to do so from making appointments "on their own sense of expediency" or from "personal opinions upon the teaching of the institution"—evils the committee seeks to remedy. If the dangers are not exaggerated, the reforms must be sure and radical: nothing less than the permanent appointment of a faculty representative (or representatives) to the board of trustees, not as a legate but as a full member of the board. Only by some such step will the dignified, direct, and permanent participation of the faculty in the administration of their own colleges ever be attained.

THE MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

On December 30 and 31, 1915, there was held at Columbus, Ohio, the organization meeting of a new national mathematical association, the call for which had been signed by 450 persons representing every state in the Union, the District of Columbia, and Canada. The object of the new Association is to assist in promoting the interests of mathematics in America, especially in the collegiate field. It is not intended to be a rival of any existing organization, but rather to supplement the secondary associations on the one hand, and the American Mathematical Society on the other, the former being well organized and effective in their field, and the latter having definitely limited itself to the field of scientific research. In the field of collegiate mathematics, however, there has been, up to this time, no organization and no medium of communication among the teachers, except the *American Mathematical Monthly*, which for the past three years has been devoted to this cause. The new organization, which has been named the Mathematical Association of America, has taken over the *Monthly* as its official journal.

There were 104 persons present at the organization meeting. The constitution and by-laws together with a full report of the proceedings will be published in the January issue of the *Monthly*. The following officers were elected: president, Professor E. R. Hedrick, University of Missouri; first vice-president, Professor E. V. Huntington, Harvard University; second vice-president, Professor G. A. Miller, University of Illinois; secretary-treasurer, Professor W. D. Cairns, Oberlin College; Publication Committee, Professor H. E. Slaughter, University of Chicago; managing editors, Professor W. H. Bussey, University of Minnesota, and Professor R. D. Carmichael, University of Illinois. These officers, together with the following, constitute the Executive Council: Professor R. C. Archibald, Brown University; Professor Florian Cajori, Colorado College; Professor B. F. Finkel, Drury College; Professor D. N. Lehmer, University of California; Professor E. H. Moore, University of Chicago; Professor R. E. Moritz, University of Washington; Professor M. B. Porter, University of Texas; Professor K. D. Swartzel, Ohio State University; Professor J. N. Van der Vries, University of Kansas; Professor Oswald Veblen, Princeton University; Professor J. W. Young, Dartmouth College; Professor Alexander Ziwet, University of Wisconsin.

WISCONSIN REPUDIATES PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF TEACHERS

Wisconsin has been making an effort in recent years to raise the teaching profession in the secondary schools to a high level. The certification law requires that teachers entering the secondary schools of the state shall have the same credentials as are required by the department of education in the state university for graduation from the division which trains teachers for secondary schools. The department of teacher-training of the University of Wisconsin has been vigorous in its gradual increase of requirements for those who graduate from this division of the University. In this way the state has been supplied with an automatic agency which has operated gradually to raise the level of the teaching profession. It is stated that the law has, in the past, not been fully operative because the State Superintendent has in many cases issued certificates without requiring the full compliance with this law.

At the present time there is a certificating board to which these matters are referred. This certificating board gave out, on November 27, a statement with regard to its interpretation of the law, and in this interpretation it has been supported by the action of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin. It appears that the division of the University which has had charge of the training of teachers has been advancing a little too rapidly, according to the views of the State Superintendent and some others in the various departments of the University and throughout the state. Apparently officers in the English department, for example, have desired to license their students without the long and laborious training that is involved in knowing something about the organization of secondary schools and something about the methods of teaching high-school subjects. Other departments have thought of these professional requirements as purely perfunctory or entirely unnecessary.

The licensing board is now clearly convinced that the state would lose greatly by requiring any such high standards as have been required in the past. To be sure, the example of California would seem to be instructive if these gentlemen had examined that record. The state of California has had, for some years, a rigid requirement of professional training. The result is that the secondary schools of that state have gone forward with great rapidity. Wisconsin might have served as a shining example in the middle states of a similar improvement in secondary schools and in the teaching profession, but the board has seen fit to act in exactly the opposite way. The sophistry in which it has indulged is set forth in the following quotation from its own statement. We quote it at length because it furnishes an interesting example of how one can throw overboard all of the strong principles for which his predecessors have been laboring.

When the University raised its minimum to seventeen credits in psychology and pedagogy, the question arose what effect this action should have on the policy of the board of examiners and of the state superintendent in regard to the licensing of teachers. Should the graduates, not only of Ripon and Milwaukee-Downer, but all who desire to enter the state—the graduates of Chicago and Harvard—be obliged to meet the new standard? This question was practically settled by the Board of Regents of the University, who adopted

a proviso to the effect that the adoption of the new requirement should not operate to increase the requirements of other colleges in the state. Although this vote has no legal effect in controlling the board of examiners, it is plain that in equity and sound judgment the examiners could not disregard it.

Another question presented itself. Should students of our state university be placed on a different footing from those graduating from other colleges, as to their privilege of choice of taking twelve or seventeen credits in psychology and pedagogy? Such a course seemed to the Regents inequitable, and they provided that the adoption of the new requirement was with the understanding that graduates of the University of Wisconsin who do not take the increased requirement in psychology and pedagogy should not be placed at a disadvantage in comparison with graduates of other institutions.

The Superintendent will grant licenses as a matter of course to all graduates recommended by the University as having fulfilled the new requirements. Applications of graduates from the University of Wisconsin who offer only twelve or fewer credits in psychology and pedagogy will hereafter be referred to the board of examiners, and the examiners will license such graduates of the University of Wisconsin on the same terms with graduates of other institutions of higher learning. The board will receive the evidence of graduation and the certified standings of such students from the registrar, and will issue licenses to them in accordance with the regulations governing in the case of graduates of the other recognized colleges.

This discussion opens the way for the ruling which now admits to the faculties of the high schools of Wisconsin college graduates who have never taken any professional work. There is a regulation to the effect that some professional reading will be required during the teacher's experience before he can get a permanent license. The urgency with which this requirement will be enforced can probably be guessed from the attitude of the board with regard to professional requirements in general. Certainly the amount and character of such professional work taken during the teacher's active experience will be highly questionable if it is not checked up by some vigorous institution entirely in sympathy with that type of training.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools passed a regulation some years ago which makes it essential that the teachers who are admitted to schools within this Association shall have some professional training. Wisconsin evidently does not care whether the North Central Association requires such training for better schools or not. Wisconsin has shown, during

recent years, that the development of high standards in professional education is extremely difficult in a democratic community. This last act of repudiation of a stand taken some years ago is only part of a general campaign of educational deterioration which has been going on in that state for some time. One hardly needs to be a prophet to say that Wisconsin will reap the result of this withdrawal from former standards in a lower grade of teachers entering her secondary schools. One certainly does not need to be a prophet to point out that this backward step will be a dark spot in the history of the state when in later years high standards are again restored, in the hands of those who realize that professional training is as essential in the teaching profession as it is in any of the other professions which have to do with the welfare of the community.

C. H. J.

MORAL CONDITIONS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Two notable papers dealing with this question recently appeared in *Religious Education*. Franklin W. Johnson, of the University of Chicago High School, confines himself to a discussion of dishonesty among high-school students; Jesse B. Davis, of Detroit Central High School, Grand Rapids, Michigan, considers gambling, drinking, questionable places of amusement, and personal impurity as well as dishonesty. Each of these men is speaking primarily of conditions in his own school.

Principal Johnson says that dishonesty in athletics, in class work, and in the common practice of "filching" signs and souvenirs is the reflection chiefly of two causes: first, a fundamental lack of moral standards in society at large, the children being as honest in their sports as their parents are in business; and, secondly, the importance and the glare of publicity which are placed upon interscholastic athletics, accompanied by an exaggerated desire to win, and the sedulous aping of the evil practices of college sports.

Principal Davis describes a unique investigation of 614 boys in Detroit Central High School made by a student committee. With due reservation for inexperience and error in judgment, Superintendent Davis believes that the findings of this committee are substantially correct. They found that 13.2 per cent of the boys were habitual smokers, and that 32.7 per cent sometimes indulged. Twenty-four per cent were guilty of gambling, gambling being defined, not only as

betting on games, but also as paying for a losing pool game, pitching nickels, and the like. There were 9.1 per cent of the boys who were guilty of drinking intoxicating liquors, most of them having been taught to do so in their own homes; 10.9 per cent wasted time in places of questionable character; 3.2 per cent were classified as impure in personal or social relations. In connection with this topic, says Mr. Davis: "It may be added that the testimony of the physical director was that at that time there was not a single instance of venereal disease among the boys of the school."

The problem which these two educators are attacking is fraught with untold difficulties. Under the leadership of each man there is being organized a definite program for the cultivation of effective public opinion among the students themselves. A sturdy and vigorous tradition of honor, of honesty, and of purity, a tradition which will ostracize the offender, together with some manifestation of these traditions in the form of a student court or a student supervising body, appears to be the essence of their program.

EXTENSION OF THE POWERS OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Secretary of the Interior Lane, in his annual report, gives serious attention to the status of the Bureau of Education. He asserts:

The United States maintains a Bureau of Education in this department, which, upon a small appropriation, collates as best it can the figures and facts which most inadequately tell the story of the growth and use of this most brilliantly conceived piece of governmental machinery.

The American people are not indifferent to their schools. Quite otherwise. They pay for their support almost as much as they do for the support of the entire federal government; in round numbers, three-quarters of a billion dollars a year, which keeps an army of 600,000 teachers at work. Education is indeed our foremost industry, from whatever point of view it may be regarded. Yet I am assured that it has made less progress than any of our other industries during the past thirty years. With all the marvelous record of what the mind of a quick people may produce to make life happier and nature more serviceable, how little can be shown as our contribution to the methods of improving the mind and skill of the young! We have gone to Europe—to Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and Denmark chiefly—for the new methods with which we have experimented, and Japan has found a way to instruct through the eyes and hands that will make these very practical people still more distinguished.

Yet here and there under rare leadership may be found in this country the most striking proofs of what can be done to tie our schools to our life. The hope is eventually to make the school what it should be, and easily may

be, the very heart of the community—social club and co-operative center as well as school.

There would seem to be nothing visionary in such a hope. To effect this evolution there is needed primarily leadership, and this the government must give if it is to realize its desire for a people who are both skilled and happy. The spirit of our people is against a paternal government. We do not take with kindness to an authority that is mandatory. There is a sound belief that a people who make their own way are in the end riper and of stronger fiber than those who accept what is not the result of common determination. But this spirit of intense individualism does not make us independent of, or indifferent to, useful methods and helpful standards. And it is these that we can reveal. It is these that we should find and place in service, rather than force the disconnected schools of the land to feel their way out or "muddle through." We may not command, but we may "show how." This is democracy's substitute for absolutism in the effort to secure efficiency. For such policy of helpfulness there is abundant precedent, not only in the action of Congress in making minor appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Education on precisely these lines, but in the activities of other departments. The country is dotted with experimental farms which prove soil values, and the farmer of today is learning from the government how great and all-embracing must be the knowledge necessary to the carrying on of his work, for he must know of chemistry, mechanics, markets, and finance, transportation, and a world of things which his father or grandfather would have laughed at as the frills of a doctrinaire education, notwithstanding the early example of the wise and many-sided farmer who was the third President of this country.

I have said in a previous report that the Bureau of Education should either be abolished or put to serious high purpose. I believe the latter to be the wise, in fact the necessary, course. There is a real use for it. As in the Bureau of Mines we seek to save the lives of miners by educating them in the use of explosives and life-saving apparatus, and by instructing operators in safe methods of building their vast underground workshops, so I would erect the Bureau of Education into a Bureau of Educational Methods and Standards in which would be gathered the ripe fruit of all educational experiments upon which the schools of the country could draw. This is a wide country, and there is need for a national clearing-house where can be centered and exchanged the results of the most remote experiments.

The Commissioner has perhaps underestimated the contributions of America and overestimated the contributions of Italy and Japan to educational sciences. He certainly has laid his hand upon the fundamental doctrine of democracy, which is the main reason why this nation has lagged somewhat behind more highly centralized governments. "A people who make their own way are in the end riper and of stronger fiber than those who accept what is not the result of common determina-

tion." Moreover, the evolution of a suitable school system in a young country is much more difficult than in an older society. It may be pointed out, also, that America must evolve a system not for a highly stratified society, as in Germany, where a child is born to an education thought to be suitable for his birth. America is moving slowly, in order to provide for efficient industrial education, to be sure, but even more important, to enable every youth, however humble his birth, to rise through education to the full height of his possibilities. The United States wants no school system which condemns the son of an artisan to become nothing better than an artisan.

With the principal suggestion of Commissioner Lane, every educator must be in hearty accord. By all means expand the Bureau of Educational into a Bureau of Educational Methods and Standards; increase the powers of the Commissioner of Education and his department, that they may enlarge the admirable work they are already performing, and become a thoroughly equipped "national clearing-house where can be centered and exchanged" the ripe fruit of all educational experiments.

THE ABOLITION OF HOME STUDY

The purpose of the California law prohibiting home study for elementary-school pupils under fifteen years of age is explained by Charles C. Hughes, city superintendent of Sacramento, in his annual report:

It was necessary to meet another condition which your superintendent believes to be a basic principle in school work, and which is the central idea of the course of study in use in our city. *Pupils must be trained to study.* It is believed that to know how to study is more important than to know how to recite, and that this important part of the child's training should be accomplished under the direct supervision of the teacher in the schoolroom, and not left to the busy home. It is the business of the school, not of the home, and the school has no right to shift the responsibility. It is rare, indeed, to find a home with proper facilities for study. The child needs opportunity and place for concentration, the light must be right, there must be proper ventilation, there must be quiet if the lesson is to be well learned. From a physiological standpoint, assuming that the child will do his studying after the evening meal, he can hardly begin his work with any chance of success until at least an hour after he has eaten. This would bring his work until half-past seven or eight o'clock, and in most of our homes even later. The child should have time to digest his food, and a normal child should grow sleepy very early in the evening. He should be in bed by half-past nine or ten o'clock. Thus it is seen how little

time really exists for the preparation of the lessons for the next day, and the weakness proven of assuming that all children will come to school prepared for their work. It can be easily figured how great is the loss in the effort of the teacher to listen to recitations in lessons which have not been prepared. The brighter pupil will bluff his way through, the duller pupil will gain little from the time spent. Therefore in preparing a lesson schedule it is necessary to find time for study-periods for each subject needing preparation. In doing so, the traditional amount of time devoted to each subject per week has been reduced by the addition of study-periods and subjects for general training, but the reduction is more than made up by intensive preparation and study under the eye and direction of the teacher rather than in the careless, haphazard way usually followed. The result is that the teachers have a time schedule and a lesson schedule on which their weekly programs are based, and in accordance with which the course of study is prepared. These schedules do not hamper the teacher in originality or individuality. She may place her subjects wherever she pleases. They have nothing to do with the method. A teacher's method may be the best for her, and so long as it is a successful method, it is not interfered with. The object of the program is to regulate the relative value of subjects and to hold the study work in the schoolroom, under the supervision of the teacher, where it belongs.

ADMISSION BY CERTIFICATE IN DARTMOUTH

State universities have long been experimenting with the essential features of the plan of certification which Dartmouth has recently announced. It is doubtful, however, if any inspection and estimate of high schools have been so carefully planned as to be of worth for all parties concerned. Especially commendable is the opportunity any school may have of a sympathetic and thorough inspection, together with recommendations for improvement. Making the pupil's record in college an essential part of the evaluation of the worth of his preparatory school is likely to throw an increased sense of responsibility upon public-school men.

The granting or reissuing of the certificate privilege will be decided by the Committee after due consideration of: (1) the report of the visitor from the faculty; (2) the record of the graduates of the school who have entered Dartmouth, if any; (3) the standing of the school in the rating of the State Department of Education and other certifying bodies; (4) the information contained in the application blank submitted by the principal of the school. The Committee will endeavor to decide each application upon its merits; particular attention will be paid to: (1) the quality of the instruction, as influenced by training of teachers, pupils per teacher, classes per teacher; (2) the equipment

of the school, including laboratory and library facilities; (3) the course of study, indicated by length of school year, length of actual teaching period, number of recitations per week in each subject, provision for concentration on certain subjects, and opportunity for the study of electives.

The Committee recognizes the necessity of a somewhat different standard of graduation from secondary school and certification to college. It urges that principals signing the certificates of pupils insist that actual evidence be given of the ability of the pupil to gain profit from a college course such as Dartmouth offers. The certification of any other pupils, no matter how worthy, is unfair to the College, the pupil, and the principal and school whose approval they bear. The College sets no definite mark which must be gained before a pupil shall be certified; it views with apprehension, however, the issuance of a certificate to a pupil whose standing was below 85; in uncertain cases entrance examinations may be taken, and the responsibility for the pupil's fitness placed upon the College. Due record will be kept of those principals who do not use the certificate privilege wisely. As in the past, the Committee intends to send to each school, after midyear's, the first semester marks of its graduates who are in the Freshman class.

The visit of the representative of the faculty may be of service to the school in many ways: the Dartmouth grades of the school's graduates may be discussed; the pupils preparing for college, or only those preparing for Dartmouth, may meet the visitor and discuss with him questions of proper preparation for college life; in certain cases a meeting of the teachers may be arranged; nearly all the visitors will be glad to speak informally at the school assembly, if desired; the Executive Secretary of the Committee is prepared to give an informal talk on "College and College Life," using lantern slides of various colleges; an informal conference with the parents of boys preparing for Dartmouth has frequently proved of mutual value.

In addition to any comments made during the visit, the Committee will gladly send to the principal, superintendent, or school board its evaluation of the school, indicating both strong features and those which may, in its opinion, be strengthened. As the purpose of the visit is co-operation rather than criticism, such a report will be sent only when definitely requested.

THE HIGH-SCHOOL COURSE IN ENGLISH

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, spelling in American schools became a craze. Elaborate school instruction was supplemented by spelling-schools and spelling-matches. Webster's *Blue Backed Speller* enjoyed a sale unrivaled in our school annals. Fifty years after the dominance of spelling, English grammar rose to its height, occupying in 1850-70 from three to seven years of the elementary-school program and in addition a prominent place in the high school. After 1870, with

the tendency of grammar to subside to its correct place as an incidental study, composition gained in strength and together with literature, carefully prescribed by college-entrance requirements, is today monopolizing one-fourth of the high-school curriculum, while formal language lessons predominate in the elementary schools. Thus it has been the fate of new branches in vernacular instruction, after they have once been introduced into the curriculum, to be carried to excess.

The history of spelling and of grammar suggests that a few decades later educators will be saying that the school of 1900-1920 had not discovered that language habits are most advantageously acquired in classes other than formal composition; and that literature is a present reality, with living poets and prose writers, as well as a dusty contribution from masters who lived centuries ago. Future historians of the curriculum may smile at the excess of oral composition as we carry it today into elaborate state declamatory contests, just as they will ridicule our excess in interscholastic athletics.

In the light of the past one argument for increasing the time and strength given to formal classes in composition and literature is at least questionable. If children cannot spell, give them more classes in spelling; if they are grammatically inaccurate, give them more instruction in grammar; if they cannot write, give them more classes in composition; if they cannot enjoy the pale heroes of King Arthur's court, give them Milton's *Minor Poems* and Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*. It was apparently the sound logic of this argument that led to wild excess in spelling about 1825 and in grammar about 1875. The same logic is operating powerfully today in advancing composition and literature to their present status.

There can be little doubt that 1900-1916 is the heyday of formal composition and of the classics in the English curriculum, just as 1825 was the heyday of spelling, and 1860 the heyday of grammar. And still the cry is that, because English departments are failures, because the product is exceedingly imperfect, we must have more English branches and larger appropriations.

English teachers do not care to raise the question whether the product of the schools in science, in mathematics, in the modern languages is of a relatively higher standard than in English. English is, indeed, more fortunate than its sister-studies in being able to have the value of its product weighed every day in the practical life of its graduates. If the ability of pupils to apply mathematics, science, and modern languages were viewed with the same critical eye as the product of the

English department, the inferiority of English teaching might not be so apparent. But English welcomes this criticism of its efficiency. English is experimenting with conversation lessons, with present-day literature; English is begging other departments to co-operate in establishing correct language habits; English is endeavoring to put oral composition on a sensible basis. Here and there a daring reformer is advocating less time for formal English classes, their place to be taken by more general and uniform guidance in language habits. Here and there school officers are rejecting teachers of other departments whose English is slovenly, just as they reject candidates whose appearance is slatternly. History in the teaching of the mother-tongue is being made today. The essence of the new movement in vernacular instruction is well expressed by Sir Oliver Lodge who says that "language must be learned in a pupil's stride—not by years of painful application."

The *School Review* submits that our present curriculum in the vernacular, particularly in the secondary schools, is not teaching English "in the stride of the pupils." It is attempting to pound English in by years of painful application.